REMARKS

Claims 18 to 37 are pending in this application of which claims 18 and 28 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Ewin et al. (U.S. Patent 3,536,842) in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (MPCD). Claims 19 and 27 to 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ewin in view of Kelly et al. (U.S. Patent 4,862,496) and MPCD. As shown above, Applicant has amended the claims to define the invention more clearly. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the art rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 is directed to a method for determining a connection path for a connection request in a communication network. The method includes determining whether a connection path to a destination node of the communication network is stored in a second memory. Determining whether a connection path to a destination node of the communication network is stored in a second memory includes determining whether a connection path to the destination node conforms to transmission requirements of the connection request. If the connection path is not stored in the second memory, the method includes determining the connection path based on network data stored in a first memory. Determining the connection path includes determining whether the connection path to the destination node conforms to the transmission requirements of the connection request. The network data describes the communication network. The method also includes storing the connection path in the second memory and communicating path

information corresponding to the connection path to network nodes that are part of the connection path in order to set up the connection path.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, none of the references cited by the Examiner disclose or suggest that determining whether a connection path to a destination node of the communication network is stored in a second memory includes determining whether the connection path to the destination node conforms to transmission requirements of a connection request.

In this regard, Ewin discloses determining a connection path based a priority of a call and a trunk history of call completions (see, e.g., column 5, lines 14 to 23 of Ewin). However, Ewin does not disclose or suggest that determining whether the connection path to the destination node of the communication network is stored in a second memory includes determining whether the connection conforms to the transmission requirements of the connection request.

MPCD describes a cache memory that checks to see whether it holds an address in cache and, if the address is not in cache, then regular memory is accessed to obtain another pre-stored connection path (see "cache" on page 72 of MPCD). However, MPCD does not disclose or suggest transmission requirements of the connection request, much less that determining the connection path includes determining whether the connection path to the destination node conforms to the transmission requirements of the connection request.

Kelly, which was cited against other claims, discloses determining a connection path probabilistically. However, Kelly does disclose or suggest transmission requirements of the connection request, much less that determining the connection path includes determining

whether the connection path to a destination node conforms to the transmission requirements of the connection request.

Accordingly, whether taken alone or in a combination, Kelly, Ewin and the MPCD reference are not understood to disclose or suggest that determining the connection path includes determining whether the connection path to the destination node conforms to the transmission requirements of the connection request.

Claim 28 is directed to switching equipment for determining a connection path in a communication network that roughly corresponds to claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 28 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejections.

Applicant submits that all dependent claims now depend directly or indirectly on allowable independent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

It is further believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The correspondence address for Applicant's attorney is shown below. Applicant's attorney may also be reached by telephone at (617) 521-7896.

A check in the amount of $110 for the requisite one-month Extension of Time fee is enclosed herewith. Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket 12758-049US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 9, 2004

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20860491.doc